**DBQ Rubric (7 Pts)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Thesis** (2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Thesis makes a historically defensible claim and specifically addresses all parts of the prompt. (1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **General Comments:** |
|  | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Contains a well-developed, cohesive argument throughout, which accounts for historical complexity by illustrating contradictory, corroborative, & qualified relationships among historical evidence. (1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **Improvements Needed:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Thesis is properly argumentative but is too simplistic and lacks the necessary level of specificity. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Thesis contains awkward organization, may be off-topic, or contain factual inaccuracies. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Argumentation within body paragraphs and/or document usage is not supportive of the thesis. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Document Usage** | | | | | | | **1** | | | | **2** | | | **3** | | **4** | | **5** | **6** | **7** | | | **TOTAL** | | | |  | |
|  | | context | | | | |  | | | |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  | | |  | | | | **General Comments:** | |
| **a**udience | | | | |  | | | |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  | | |  | | | |
| **p**urpose | | | | |  | | | |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  | | |  | | | |
| **p**oint of View | | | | |  | | | |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  | | |  | | | |
|
|
| 1. **Document Analysis**(2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Utilizes content of at **least six** of the documents to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **General Comments:** |
|  | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Explains the significance of the historical context, the audience, the author’s purpose, and/or the author’s point of view for at least four documents. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **Improvements Needed:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Document usage is lacking in the analysis of historical context, audience, purpose, and/or POV | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Utilizes the content of fewer than 6 documents in support of the stated thesis or relevant argument. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Documents are simply listed, summarized, or quoted. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Using Evidence Beyond the Documents** (2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | ***Contextualization*:** uses knowledge not found in the documents to place the argument within broader historical events, developments, or processes immediately relevant to the question. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **General Comments:** |
|  | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | ***Outside Evidence*:** provides numerous examples or additional pieces of specific supportive evidence beyond those found in the docs & different from the evidence used to earn other pts on this rubric. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **Improvements Needed:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Attempts at contextualization are underdeveloped, lack explanation, hastily phrased, or non-existent. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Outside evidence is the same as in the documents or other categories of this rubric, lacks explanation, is irrelevant to the argument, or non-existent. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **D. Synthesis** (1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Essay extends the argument by explaining the connections between the argument and ONE of the following:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Development in a diff era period, situation, or region. | | | | | |  | | Course theme and/or approach to history that is not the focus of the essay (ENV, CUL, SB, ECON, CUL). | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | A diff discipline or field of study (econ, anthro, art history, poli- sci). | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Improvements Needed:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **General Comments:** | | | | | | |
|  | There are no attempts at synthesis. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Attempts at synthesis are unsuccessful due to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | inaccuracy |  | irrelevancy | | | | | | |  | lack of specificity/proper development | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | |
| **Additional Feedback:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Be specific! | | | | |  | | | Some inaccuracies | | | | | |  | | writing lacks sophistication | | | | | | |  | | Well organized | |
|  | more evidence needed | | | | |  | | | no shorthand | | | | | |  | | needs better organization | | | | | | |  | | Nice thesis | |
|  | FLUFF! More depth | | | | |  | | | budget your time | | | | | |  | | Study more – content weak | | | | | | |  | | Good subject knowledge | |
|  | Improve doc usage | | | | |  | | | use past tense | | | | | |  | | You’re getting there | | | | | | |  | | Good analysis/connections | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCORE** |  | **Essay Score Conversion** | | | | | | |
|  |  | 7  100% | 6  95% | 5  90% | 4  80% | 3  70% | 2  60% | 1  50% |